

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 09/386,556

Filing Date: August 31, 1999

Title: PERIPHERAL UNIVERSAL BUS HUB

Page 2

Atty Dkt: P1190US00

1  
wherein said second communications protocol connector is configured in accordance with a protocol chosen from a group consisting of: parallel, serial port, IEEE-48, RS-232, Centronics parallel and gameport.

32. (New) The peripheral input device of claim 31, further comprising:  
a wireless port configured for connection to at least one wireless peripheral device.

**REMARKS**

Claims 29-32 are added by this Amendment. As a result, claims 1-32 are now pending in the application.

The Office Action includes: i) a rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 12-14, 16-19 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(g) in view of U.S. Patent 5,790,201 ("Antos"); and ii) a rejection of claims 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 20-22, 27 and 28 in view of the Antos patent and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,890,015 ("Garney"). There drawings have been approved.

**§102 Rejection of the Claims**

It is respectfully submitted that the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(g) is not properly drawn since the application is not involved in an interference proceeding. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(g) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, even in the event that a rejection under §102(b) is next applied, it is respectfully submitted that such a rejection could not be maintained, for at least the following reasons.

The present invention involves an input device, such as a keyboard, which serves as a protocol hub having a number of connectors for connecting additional peripherals to the input device. This allows peripherals to be removably connected to the input device, instead of having them non-removably connected as an integral part of the main computer unit. By providing connectors instead of having the peripherals hardwired to the input device, a user has the flexibility to selectively connect those additional peripherals which are deemed most useful (e.g., mouse or other pointing device, a scanner, a printer, joysticks, game pads, or the like such as a

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 09/386,556

Filing Date: August 31, 1999

Title: PERIPHERAL UNIVERSAL BUS HUB

Page 3

Atty Dkt: P1190US00

PDA or communication device), or are needed for a particular application. In short, the connectors allow a user to have a great deal of flexibility in configuring which additional peripherals—or none—to connect to the input device.

The Office Action relies upon the Antos patent, asserting that Antos teaches every feature of claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 12-14, 16-19 and 26. This assertion is respectfully traversed. The Antos patent pertains to a television and computer integration system. The system of Antos does indeed show peripherals (i.e., a joystick and a mouse) stemming from a keyboard. However, as seen in Figure 1 of the Antos patent, the peripherals of the Antos system are directly connected—that is, the peripherals are a hardwired integral part of the keyboard. The Antos patent does not teach the use of connectors for attaching the peripherals to its keyboard. Moreover, the Antos patent teaches away from the use of connects in this context, as discussed below in further detail in regard to the §103 rejection.

Consequently, the Antos patent does not disclose “a plurality of communications protocol connectors on the input device,” as recited in claim 1; or “a plurality of connector slots on the input device,” as recited in claim 9 and in claim 12; or “a plurality of communications protocol connectors,” as recited in claim 17. Moreover, since the peripherals of the Antos device are not disclosed to be removably connected, Antos does not teach connecting them using a communication protocol. Hence, the Antos patent does not disclose “an alphanumeric keypad connectable to a host device by a wireless connection” and “a plurality of communications protocol connectors,” as recited in claim 18; or “connecting peripherals of the system to a single input device” and “through the input device communications protocol hub,” as recited in claim 19; or “linking the peripherals of a computer input device to a mina computer unit through a communications protocol hub on the input device,” as recited in claim 26.

Accordingly, Antos does not disclose the features of the present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) would not be proper.

§103 Rejection of the Claims: Antos Teaches Away from Combination

The §103 rejection of claims 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 20-22, 27 and 28 in view of the Antos patent and further in view of Garney is respectfully traversed.

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 09/386,556

Filing Date: August 31, 1999

Title: PERIPHERAL UNIVERSAL BUS HUB

Page 4

Atty Dkt: P1190US00

It is submitted that the Antos patent teaches away from combination with the Garney patent, thus rendering the hypothetical combination of these two patents improper in accordance with MPEP 2143, which states:

If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.<sup>1</sup>

In the instant case, the Antos patent expressly states that its keyboard "preferably includes an *integral mouse* 30 and *integral joystick* 32 electrically coupled thereto as shown."<sup>2</sup> Figure 1 of Antos shows the peripherals directly connected to the keyboard 14, and does not teach any use of connectors according to the present invention. As such, the Antos patent teaches away from removably connecting the mouse and joystick to the keyboard, instead showing an "integral mouse 30 and integral joystick 32 electrically couple[d]" to the keyboard. In view of this teaching, the combination of the Antos patent and the Garney patent is improper since Antos teaches away from their combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

<sup>1</sup> MPEP 2143.1 citing *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).

<sup>2</sup> Antos, col. 3, lines 27-29 (emphasis added).

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 09/386,556

Filing Date: August 31, 1999

Title: PERIPHERAL UNIVERSAL BUS HUB

Page 5

Atty Dkt: P1190US00

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, notification to that effect is earnestly requested. In the event that issues arise in the application which may readily be resolved via telephone, the Examiner is kindly invited to telephone the Gateway, Inc. attorney at (605)232-1967 to facilitate prosecution of the application.

It is believed that the attached Fee Transmittal attends to the appropriate fees owed for the present Amendment. However, if necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0439.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 14, 2002

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Charles Richardson  
Reg. No. 43,436